

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 143-148 are currently pending. Claims 143 and 146 are independent and are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 143-148 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,148,154 to MacKay et al. (hereinafter, merely “MacKay”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,537,528 to Takahashi et al. (hereinafter, merely “Takahashi”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,487,141 to Cain et al. (hereinafter, merely “Cain”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,544,318 to Schmitz et al. (hereinafter, merely “Schmitz”).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 146 is representative and recites, *inter alia*:

“ . . . the graphical user interface displays the clip name of the clip being edited by the edit module surrounded by a frame with a line bolder than a line of a frame surrounding a clip name of a clip that is not being edited by the edit module, and
...

. . .the graphical user interface displays each edit resultant clip in the tree structure corresponding to the clip being edited surrounded by a frame with a line bolder than the line of a frame surrounding an edit resultant clip not corresponding to the clip being edited.” Emphasis added)

Claim 146 recites, “the graphical user interface displays the clip name of the clip being edited by the edit module surrounded by a frame with a line bolder than a line of a frame surrounding a clip name of a clip that is not being edited by the edit module, and . . . the graphical user interface displays each edit resultant clip in the tree structure corresponding to the clip being edited surrounded by a frame with a line bolder than the line of a frame surrounding an edit resultant clip not corresponding to the clip being edited.”

That is, the graphical user interface (GUI) displays the tree structure of the clips on a display in a hierarchical structure. The clip name of the clip being edited to produce the resultant clip is surrounded by a frame having lines that are bolder than lines of a frame surrounding the clip name of a clip that is not being edited. Furthermore, the GUI also surrounds each edit resultant clip in the tree structure corresponding to the clip being edited with a frame having lines bolder than lines of a frame surrounding edit resultant clips not corresponding to the clip being edited.

That is, in addition to displaying the hierarchical structure of the clip names, the clip whose clip name is surrounded by a frame with a bold line is a clip being displayed at present to

be edited AND the edit resultant clip of the clip being edited also is surrounded with a bold frame. Publ. App. par. [140] and FIGS. 10-12.

The present application has the advantage that not only is it clear which clip is being edited but also which edit resultant clips are affected by the editing of the clip.

The Office Action points to Schmitz, col. 13, lines 7-12, for the above recited element of claim 146. However, Schmitz does not disclose linking a clip being edited to each edit resultant clips that is affected by that edited clip. Schmitz only shows a picture 56A is highlighted to reflect that it is the current picture corresponding to an edit element 58A. Moreover, edit element 58A is merely a graphical timeline and does not represent edit resultant clips linked to clips being edited. Furthermore, in the present application, all the edit resultant clips affected by the clip being edited are highlighted.

The above discussed feature of the display of clips being edited is not disclosed in Takahashi, MacKay or Cain.

Claim 143 is patentable over Mackay, Takahashi, Cain and Schmitz because those references taken alone or in combination do teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claim.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 146, independent claim 143 is also believed to be patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 143-148 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800